DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 046 FL 018 361

AUTHOR Riddle, Wayne Clifton
TITLE Foreign Language and International Education: The Federal Role. CRS Report for Congress.
INSTITUTION Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Congressional Research Service.
PUB DATE 20 Nov 89
NOTE 51p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Area Studies; Budgeting; Degrees (Academic); Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; Higher Education; International Education; International Educational Exchange; *International Studies; Language Attitudes; Policy Formation; Program Termination; Public Opinion; *Public Policy; Retrenchment; *Second Language Programs
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title II; Europe (East); Fulbright Hays Act; Higher Education Act Title VI; Japan; USSR

ABSTRACT

Currently, the Federal Government provides funds to a variety of postsecondary foreign language and international studies education programs authorized under Title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA). Elementary and secondary foreign language and international studies programs are authorized under Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and additional postsecondary programs under HEA Title VI, but these are not currently funded. Related activities are also supported by the State Department's Soviet-East European Studies Program and the Japan-United States Friendship Commission. Critiques of both the quantity and quality of American education are commonplace. Individual analysts and study commissions have frequently concluded that requirements and offerings fall well below those in other major nations and below the level required for economic competitiveness and educational excellence. Concerns about inefficient program coordination, imbalances in attention paid to different world regions and languages, and limited or static funding are expressed frequently. Options for the future federal role in this area include: (1) termination of specific support, relying on general postsecondary aid and market forces to influence student decisions; (2) maintenance of current support; and (3) expansion and consolidation of federal aid. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

89-657 EPW

CRS Report for Congress

ED316046

Foreign Language and International Educaton: The Federal Role

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Riddle, W.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Wayne Clifton Riddle
Specialist in Education Finance
Education and Public Welfare Division

November 20, 1989

CRS

Congressional Research Service • The Library of Congress

FL018361

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Congressional Research Service works exclusively for the Congress, conducting research, analyzing legislation, and providing information at the request of committees, Members, and their staffs.

The Service makes such research available, without partisan bias, in many forms including studies, reports, compilations, digests, and background briefings. Upon request, CRS assists committees in analyzing legislative proposals and issues, and in assessing the possible effects of these proposals and their alternatives. The Service's senior specialists and subject analysts are also available for personal consultations in their respective fields of expertise.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE FEDERAL ROLE

SUMMARY

Since the adoption of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, the Federal Government has supported foreign language and international studies programs in American schools, colleges, and universities. Currently, funds are provided to a variety of postsecondary foreign language and international studies education programs authorized under title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA). Elementary and secondary foreign language and international studies programs are authorized under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and additional postsecondary programs under HEA title VI, but these are not currently funded. Related activities are also supported by the State Department's Soviet-East European Studies program and the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

Critiques of both the quantity and quality of American education in foreign languages are commonplace. Both individual analysts and study commissions have frequently concluded that the foreign language requirements and offerings of American educational institutions fall well below those in other major nations, as well as below the level required for economic competitiveness and educational excellence.

Several concerns have been expressed about the current Federal role in support of foreign language and international studies. Programs are administered by different agencies and may not be efficiently coordinated. There may be an imbalance in attention paid to different world regions and languages. Very little aid is provided to elementary and secondary foreign language instruction. And the largest program, title VI of the HEA, has experienced relatively static funding, with no appropriations for most new authorities.

Options for future evolution of Federal aid to foreign language and international studies include:

- termination of such specific support in this area, relying upon the Federal Government's general postsecondary student aid programs and labor market forces to influence student decisions,
- maintenance of the current level of Federal support, with possible redistribution among programs now authorized, and
- expansion and consolidation of Federal aid, perhaps under a national endowment or foundation for foreign language and international studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CURRENT FEDERAL PROGRAMS TO ASSIST FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION 5
TITLE VI, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT 5
Currently Funded HEA Title VI Programs 5
National Resource Centers 5
Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships . . . 6
Undergraduate Foreign Language and International Studies Programs 7
Foreign Language and International Studies Research Projects 8
Business and International Education 8
HEA Title VI Programs That Are Authorized But Not Currently Funded 10
Recent Appropriations History of HEA Title VI 10
The Significance of HEA Title VI 12
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS UNDER THE FULBRIGHT-HAYS ACT 15
TITLE II, PARTS B AND C, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT 17
TITLE V, LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT 19
SOVIET-EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES PROGRAM 19
JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION . . . 21

THE CONTEXT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES 23
AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION 23
COMPARISONS TO OTHER NATIONS 24
RECENT EDUCATIONAL POLICY REPORTS ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES 25
RESISTANCE TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION 28
FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: COURSE PARTICIPATION AND DEGREES EARNED . 30
Elementary and Secondary Education 30
Postsecondary Education 32

OPTIONS FOR FEDERAL POLICY REGARDING FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES 36
TERMINATE ALL SPECIAL FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES 36

Rationale for Termination of Federal Aid 36
Reasons to Continue Federal Support for Foreign Language and International Studies 37
MAINTAIN OR MODERATELY INCREASE THE CURRENT LEVEL OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION, BUT CONSIDER REALLOCATING THESE RESOURCES TO BETTER MEET PRESENT NEEDS . 40
Areas that Might be Considered for Increased Support . . 40
Areas that Might be Considered for Decreased Support . 42
CONSOLIDATE AND SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND FEDERAL AID TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION THROUGH ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOUNDATION OR ENDOWMENT 44
CONCLUDING COMMENTS 46

FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE FEDERAL ROLE

Since the adoption of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, the Federal Government has supported foreign language and international studies[1] programs in American schools, colleges, and universities. Currently, funds are provided to a variety of postsecondary foreign language and international studies education programs authorized under title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA). Elementary and secondary foreign language and international studies programs are authorized under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and additional postsecondary programs under HEA title VI, but these are not currently funded.

It appears there has been a significant gap at the Federal level between expressions of interest and concern about foreign language and international studies programs, and the provision of funds for them.

Concern about the quality and quantity of foreign language and international education provided to American students appears to have increased in recent years, in concert with an increasingly global orientation of American economic activity,[2] the diversity of language background of American students, and awareness of the international dimensions of many public policy issues. Several education policy study commissions have recently recommended substantial increases in course participation and resources devoted to education in these topics. This concern has been reflected in

[1]International studies programs provide instruction about one or more foreign nations or regions. This instruction may cover one or (more frequently) several significant aspects of the foreign area (politics, geography, history, economics, etc.), and may--or may not--be conducted in the language(s) used in that area.

[2]For example, the total of foreign imports and exports has increased from 10.9 percent of the United States Gross National Product (GNP) in 1965 to 21.7 percent in 1987. In addition, foreign direct investment in the United States increased from $83.0 billion in 1980 to $328.9 billion in 1988. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of Economic Analysis. *Survey of Current Business*. June 1989. p. 43.

adoption of legislation to expand the scope of HEA title VI programs in 1986,[3] and in 1988,[4] authorization of a new program of Federal aid for elementary and secondary foreign language and international studies education. However, most of these newly authorized programs have not been funded, and the appropriations for existing postsecondary education programs have remained relatively static for several years. Thus, it appears there has been a significant gap at the Federal level between expressions of interest and concern about foreign language and international studies programs, and the provision of funds to implement these programs. Perhaps the most extreme historical example of this gap is the International Education Act of 1966, a broad, multi-title authorization of Federal aid to foreign language and international studies for which no funds were ever appropriated.

This report provides information about the currently authorized programs of Federal aid to foreign language and international studies, including a brief discussion of their recent legislative and funding history, a description of the context of foreign language and international studies education in the United States, and finally, an analysis of options for Federal involvement in these subject areas. With two exceptions, these programs are administered by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). Throughout this report, discussion is limited to Federal programs supporting foreign language and international studies education at American educational institutions that are open to the public at large. Therefore, five other types of related Federal programs are **excluded**:

- programs of foreign language instruction for Federal employees that are operated by such agencies as the Departments of State and Defense,
- two-way international educational exchange programs, most of which are administered by the U.S. Information Agency (USIA),
- grants to American universities by the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID), to support technical assistance by the universities to developing countries,
- programs of American studies provided to educators and students from foreign nations by the USIA, and

---

[3]The Higher Education Amendments of 1986, P.L. 99-498.

[4]The Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, P.L. 100-418, plus the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (P.L. 100-297).

- international research and education programs that are conducted by Federal educational institutions, such as the East-West Center.[5]

[5]The East-West Center is a unique, federally established educational institution located in Honolulu, Hawaii. It conducts research and seminars, primarily on environmental and natural resource issues, for individuals from the United States and a wide variety of Asian nations. Funding is provided by the USIA, Asian governments, and private sources. Although the focus of the Center's activities is on postgraduate research and on short-term seminars, the Center does cooperate with the University of Hawaii in providing credit toward graduate degrees in Asian studies. Results of the Center's research are disseminated to academic and other institutions in the United States and abroad. The Center also supports the teaching of Asian languages and area studies in Hawaiian elementary and secondary schools.

CURRENT FEDERAL PROGRAMS TO ASSIST FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION

TITLE VI, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA)--International Education Programs--is the successor to the initial legislation authorizing Federal aid to foreign language and international studies education: title VI of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958.[6] Throughout its life, this program has assisted postsecondary programs of foreign language and international studies, mostly at the graduate level; provided fellowships to graduate students in these programs; and supported research in these subjects. More recently, aid has been provided to postsecondary programs that combine education in business with foreign language and international studies. Additional authorities in HEA title VI could, if funded, support grants to: institutions of higher education with substantial foreign language course participation and admissions/graduation requirements; intensive summer foreign language institutes; and the purchase of periodicals published outside the United States.

The title VI programs are administered by the Center for International Education (CIE) in the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education. The CIE also administers certain overseas programs of international education under the Fulbright-Hays Act (see the following section of this report), and an International Visitors Program of assistance to foreign educators visiting the United States.

The individual programs authorized under HEA title VI are described below. Title VI programs that are currently funded are described first, followed by programs that are authorized but not currently funded. Since the Congress typically provides appropriations for title VI overall, leaving to the discretion of the U.S. Department of Education (ED) the distribution of these funds among authorized programs, an appropriations history is provided for the title as a whole after the program descriptions.

Currently Funded HEA Title VI Programs

National Resource Centers

Support for the National Resource Centers have been a major activity under title VI since its original enactment in 1958. These are primarily graduate level centers or programs in institutions of higher education. The centers conduct multidisciplinary study and research on the languages, culture, politics, economy, etc., of foreign nations or regions--e.g., Russian studies,

---

[6]Title VI of the NDEA was transferred to title VI of the HEA under the Education Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-374).

Japanese studies, East Asian studies, etc. Other centers are topic oriented, providing instruction in the international aspects of contemporary economic, political, or other issues (e.g., conflict resolution, energy resources, economic development, etc.). Many of these programs and centers, which are numerous today, were initiated with assistance from title VI. The primary purpose of this program is to train specialists for professorial, government, or similar careers. The centers also conduct research, and provide outreach services to elementary, secondary, and community college teachers. This has been the largest of the title VI programs; in fiscal year (FY) 1989, ED allocated $11,234,000 to this program, making grants to 94 national resource centers.

A key issue with respect to National Resource Centers is whether the Federal aid continues to have a significant impact on programs that have generally been in operation for several years and are primarily reliant on nonfederal sources of funds.

A key issue with respect to HEA title VI aid to National Resource Centers is whether the aid continues to have a significant impact on programs that have generally been in operation for several years and are primarily reliant on nonfederal sources of funds.[7] It seems clear that this program stimulated the establishment of many graduate programs in international studies, and provided a significant share of the initial costs. However, the pace at which new international studies centers and programs are being established has declined, and Federal title VI funds now generally constitute only a small share of the revenues for them. It is possible that Federal aid has served the purpose of stimulating institutions of higher education to enter this field, and could now be more effectively used for other foreign language and international studies programs. Alternatively, continued Federal aid to international studies centers and programs may serve an important, if largely symbolic, purpose of signaling continued Federal interest in this subject area and stimulating continued support from State governments, philanthropic organizations, and institutions of higher education themselves.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships

The Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships are a complement to the National Resource Centers program described above. Fellowships are provided to graduate students at selected foreign language and international studies centers and programs. Typically, most of the centers and

---

[7]One study estimated that direct title VI grants (i.e., not including fellowships for students) constituted approximately 9 percent of foreign language and international studies center budgets. Burn, Barbara B. *Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education*. p. 117.

programs that receive National Resource Centers grants, plus a number of others, receive grants for FLAS fellowships. The fellowships pay all tuition and required fees plus a stipend for general living costs, dependent allowances, or payment of travel costs. In addition to the regular academic year awards, summer fellowships may be provided for intensive foreign language study. In FY 1989, ED allocated $7,550,000 to FLAS fellowships, providing 940 fellowships at an average of $8,032 each.

There is perennial debate over whether the Federal Government should provide scholarships or fellowships in "national priority" subject areas, such as foreign language and international studies, without regard to a student's need for financial assistance, or should provide aid that is based only on financial need, without regard to the proposed field of study. Aid for graduate study specifically in foreign language and international studies might be a necessary complement to the institutional aid provided to the National Resource Centers, to assure that these programs continue to attract an adequate number of students. However, it is difficult to precisely determine what constitutes an "adequate" number of graduate students in these subjects; and a study of former title VI fellowship recipients found that a large proportion of them eventually entered careers unrelated to their graduate study.[8] Most other Federal aid for postsecondary education expenses--e.g., Pell Grants, Stafford (Guaranteed Student) Loans, etc.--is distributed on the basis of financial need, without regard to either a student's field of study, or the student's level of academic achievement as long as "satisfactory progress" toward earning a degree is maintained.

There is perennial debate over whether the Federal Government should provide scholarships or fellowships in "national priority" subject areas, such as foreign language and international studies, without regard to a student's need for financial assistance, or should provide aid that is based only on financial need, without regard to the proposed field of study.

Undergraduate Foreign Language and International Studies Programs

In contrast to the two programs discussed above, this title VI program supports instruction at the undergraduate postsecondary level in foreign language and international studies. For example, support may be provided to initiate or expand bachelor's degree programs in foreign area studies (e.g., Japanese studies), to incorporate international studies into professional or

[8]Association of American Universities. *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*. p. 132.

preprofessional training, or to provide instruction in such subjects as international environmental or business studies. Grants may be made only to institutions of higher education or consortia of them.

In FY 1989, ED devoted $2,498,000 to 53 undergraduate foreign language and international studies grants. Examples of the purposes for which these grants were made include: implementing an international focus for the core curriculum of an undergraduate business school; developing new international studies degree programs at the baccalaureate or associate level; expanding foreign language or international studies course offerings; acquiring foreign language instructional and library materials; supporting faculty development activities such as workshops, research, etc.; initiating or expanding summer foreign language institutes; and supporting international internship opportunities for students.

Foreign Language and International Studies Research Projects

These grants may be made to institutions of higher education, other public or private, nonprofit organizations, or individuals for research and development of curricula or instructional methods in foreign language and international studies. Funded research may include the study of effectiveness of different methods of foreign language instruction, and of national needs for foreign language education. In recent years, much of the focus of this program has been on the development of curricular materials in non-western languages that are rarely taught in the United States, and for which there is a limited commercial market. In FY 1989, ED planned to provide $1,480,000 to 22 foreign language and international studies research projects. Specific activities that received grants for FY 1989 include preparation of: a primer in the Vietnamese language; computer based instructional materials in the Tamil language; a high school level course of study in Japanese; grammar texts for Yemeni Arabic and Slovene; and materials related to several other languages rarely taught in the United States.

Business and International Education

The Business and International Education authorizations are relatively new provisions of title VI, and have been the focus of much of the recent congressional interest in title VI. Authority for general aid to business and international education programs was added to title VI in 1980 (P.L. 96-374), while authority specifically for "centers" of business and international education was added in 1988 (P.L. 100-418). All of these programs are intended to help meet the needs of American firms engaged

The Business and International Education authorizations have been the focus of much of the recent Congressional interest in title VI.

in international trade through foreign language and international studies. In FY 1989, ED allocated $2,301,000 to 35 business and international education projects, while an additional $741,000 was devoted to 5 international business education center grants.[9]

Grants may be made to institutions of higher education or consortia of these. Aid provided under the *general* Business and International Education program may be used for such activities as the initiation or expansion of joint master's degree programs in business and foreign language or international studies, development of international education curricula to meet the needs of the business community, increasing the international focus of undergraduate and graduate schools of business education, student and faculty internships and fellowships, etc. The Federal share of the costs of these programs may be no more than 50 percent.

Specific activities supported by FY 1989 business and international education grants include:

- collaborative projects involving institutions of higher education, firms, and State or local government agencies, to improve the international business course offerings of colleges and universities while helping the businesses to increase their exports,
- international business internships for students and fellowships for faculty,
- international business information centers, frequently specializing in a particular world area (e.g., Latin America),
- seminars for executives in export-oriented business firms,
- joint degree programs in business and foreign language or international studies, and
- consulting services by faculty to businesses.

The latest provision for *centers* for international business education is intended to provide concentrated assistance to institutions of higher education or consortia that will serve as national resources on international business education. These centers are to provide interdisciplinary programs of foreign

---

[9]In a departure from usual congressional practice of not earmarking title VI appropriations for specific programs, the $741,000 was provided specifically for the newly authorized (P.L. 100-418) international business education center program. These funds were awarded to schools of business administration at the University of Michigan, University of Pittsburgh, University of South Carolina, University of Hawaii at Manoa, and San Diego State University/University of California at Los Angeles (joint grant).

language and international studies with business education, conduct research on international trade issues and international business curricula, and to conduct collaborative programs and research with firms, professional associations, etc. Business and international education center grants are to be made for a period of at least 3 years, with the maximum Federal share of program costs declining from 90 percent the first year to 50 percent for the third and subsequent years. Center programs are to be conducted with the assistance of a Center Advisory Council with specified membership.

HEA Title VI Programs That Are Authorized But Not Currently Funded

In 1986 (P.L. 99-498), title VI was amended to authorize three new grant programs for which appropriations have not yet been provided. These unfunded authorizations are for:

- Grants to Higher Educational Institutions With Substantial Foreign Language Course Participation and Requirements--aid to institutions of higher education at which at least 5 percent of all students are enrolled in foreign language courses, and at least 2 years of foreign language instruction are required either for admission or graduation;

- Intensive Summer Language Institutes--aid, including stipends, for intensive summer foreign language programs for either advanced students or teachers;[10] and

- Periodicals Published Outside the United States--aid to institutions of higher education and libraries to acquire, preserve, and make available periodicals published outside the United States and not commonly held in American academic libraries.

Recent Appropriations History of HEA Title VI

As noted earlier, title VI was first authorized in 1958, and appropriations have been provided since FY 1959. Title VI authorizations and appropriations during the 1980s are listed below.

---

[10]As noted earlier, some assistance to intensive summer foreign language education institutes is provided under the National Resource Center and FLAS Fellowship programs.

TABLE 1. Title VI, Higher Education Act: Authorizations and Appropriations, FY 1980-1989 (in thousands)

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1980	$75,000	$17,000
1981	57,750	19,800
1982	30,600[a]	19,200
1983	30,600	21,000
1984	30,600	25,800
1985	87,500	26,550
1986	87,500	25,408
1987	55,000	27,550
1988	"such sums"[b]	25,419
1989	"such sums"	25,855
1990	"such sums"	[35,114][c]

[a]During fiscal years 1982-84, the authorization level for title VI was limited under provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35).

[b]For fiscal years 1988 and 1989, the authorization is "such sums as may be necessary" for all provisions of title VI except centers for international business education, which are authorized at $5 million for each of fiscal years 1988-91.

[c]This is the amount that would be provided under P.L. 101-166. It may be reduced by approximately 1-2 percent under budget reconciliation legislation for FY 1990.

As illustrated in table 1, appropriations for title VI have increased in recent years. Without adjustment for price level changes, the FY 1989 appropriation was 52 percent above the FY 1980 level. However, when changes in price levels over the 1980-89 period are taken into account, the FY 1989 appropriation is actually an estimated 1 percent below the FY 1980 level.[11] Thus, the "real" level of aggregate support provided by title VI has remained essentially constant over the FY 1980-89 period, although this aid is spread over a wider range of title VI programs now than in FY 1980. While the Administration proposed termination of the title VI programs in the early years of the Reagan Presidency, the Department of Education has more

[11]Prices are adjusted using the personal consumption expenditures deflator (fixed weight version).

recently proposed that the program be maintained at approximately its current level. The FY 1990 appropriation for title VI, under P.L. 101-166, would be $35,114,000, a large ($10,000,000) increase from the FY 1989 appropriation.[12] The appropriations authorization level for title VI is "such sums as may be necessary" through FY 1991 for all programs except the Centers of International Business Education, for which the specific authorization is $5 million for each year through FY 1991.

The Significance of HEA Title VI

For several years following its original enactment in 1958, title VI was at least associated with, if it did not help cause, the initiation and growth of many postsecondary foreign language and international studies programs. This applies particularly to interdisciplinary area studies programs, many of which were established in the 1960s, either with direct assistance from title VI or following the example of such programs. The title VI program, especially the graduate student fellowships, also helped to significantly increase the number of qualified foreign language and international studies instructors at a time of rapidly increasing demand for their services, due to both rising postsecondary enrollment levels and broader interest in international studies. More recently, the Business and International Education grants appear to have helped to stimulate the development of business education programs with an international focus.

The most substantial and relatively recent study of the impact of title VI was a 1981 evaluation by the Rand Corporation,[13] which was followed by a 1983 report specifically on the title VI FLAS fellowships.[14] The authors of these reports expressed concern about conflict between title VI's twin goals of helping to train doctoral level specialists in foreign language and international studies versus supporting broader education in these subjects. They were also concerned about a decline in the ability of FLAS fellowship recipients to enter academic, government, or other careers where their special skills can be

---

[12]This amount may be reduced by 1-2 percent under budget reconciliation legislation for FY 1990. Without this reduction, the appropriation would represent a 29 percent increase over the FY 1980 level in "real" terms (i.e., adjusted for price level changes).

[13]McDonnell, Lorraine, M. *Federal Support for International Studies: The Role of NDEA Title VI.*

[14]McDonnell, Lorraine, M. *Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists, The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients.*

utilized.[15] More specifically, the Rand report argued that: title VI fellowships should be awarded with more attention to the personnel needs of the Federal Government; stipends should be increased; more fellowships should be awarded to professional students rather than those specializing in the humanities; more fellowship recipients should have an opportunity to study foreign languages in nations where they are spoken; and midcareer sabbatical awards should be authorized. The authors of the Rand reports also concluded that the research program should be better coordinated with other title VI programs and its curricular materials more widely disseminated, and that performance indicators should be established for all title VI programs.

Another relatively recent report with implications for HEA title VI is *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*. This 1984 report was prepared by the Association of American Universities for the Department of Defense, and considers not only HEA title VI but all Federal support of foreign language and international studies, both programs limited to Federal employees and those in institutions of higher education. The authors of this report recommended that:

- there should be greater coordination, especially the sharing of library and other instructional resources, between Federal agencies offering foreign language and international studies instruction and university programs supported by HEA title VI,
- there should be a supplemental title VI-type program specifically for the least commonly taught languages,
- more research should be devoted to methods of foreign language instruction and of measuring foreign language proficiency,
- more graduate students should be encouraged to specialize in the applied social sciences that are most directly relevant to public policy, rather than the humanities,
- funding for title VI, and the length of grant award periods, should be increased, and
- title VI centers should be more carefully selected and monitored.

Some critics of this program--such as the Reagan Administration in its early years, when it proposed elimination of funding for title VI--may question the significance and effectiveness of continuing Federal support of foreign language and international studies programs and students, apparently assuming that the purpose of this program was to stimulate the initiation of

---

[15]This appears to have been the result of mismatches between the national and subject fields of graduates and those of academic vacancies, not an aggregate excess supply of graduates.

these programs, but not to help maintain them. Federal funds constitute a relatively small share[16] of the revenues of foreign language and international studies departments and programs, and a variety of general Federal aid programs are available to students in these programs. A recent survey of the sources of support via grants and contracts to universities for international studies found ED programs to be the third most common source, after private foundations and individual donors.[17] Therefore, it is possible that the purpose of the program has been largely accomplished, and limited Federal funds might be more effectively utilized in other areas.

Should Federal aid be used only to initiate programs such as those under HEA title VI, or should there be continuing Federal support and influence?

However, not all would agree that the purpose of Federal programs such as title VI is simply to encourage the initiation of educational programs that afterward are to be carried out totally with nonfederal funds. Certainly the Federal Government has a continuing, perhaps even an increased, interest in developing foreign language and international studies expertise, given such trends as rising international economic competition. Further, although probably few foreign language and international studies programs would be immediately terminated if they lost their Federal support, continued support may be important as a sign of Federal interest and priorities, or as a "magnet" encouraging support from other sources. New title VI grants may also be important in stimulating the development of new curricular materials and programs in previously neglected, non-western languages and nations, which have been the focus of title VI grants in recent years. Finally, the relatively new and recently expanded Business and International Education programs may help to improve the trade competitiveness of American business firms. Unfortunately, there has been no recent research on the program upon which such conclusions might be based.

It might be worthwhile to extend title VI support to authorized activities to which ED has provided few or no funds, such as the intensive summer

---

[16]ED staff estimate that approximately 6-7 percent of the revenues of foreign language and international studies programs is provided directly by title VI grants. This does not include title VI fellowships provided to students in these programs. (Source: Testimony by C. Ronald Kimberling, Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, before the House Subcommittee on Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations, on the FY 1987 budget, p. 1324. Another source has estimated the Federal share of revenues for these programs to be 9 percent (see note 7).

[17]Andersen, Charles J. *International Studies for Undergraduates, 1987, Operations and Opinions*. p. 6.

language institutes or grants to colleges and universities which emphasize foreign language education at the undergraduate level. Although ED has substantial discretion over the distribution of title VI appropriations among the authorized activities, it has been reluctant to initiate new activities unless specifically directed to fund them in appropriations legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS UNDER THE FULBRIGHT-HAYS ACT

Other than title VI of the HEA, the only funded ED program for foreign language and international studies is a portion of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, P.L. 87-256 as amended, more commonly known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. Most of the Fulbright-Hays programs, particularly the primary exchange programs for graduate students and professors, are administered through the U. S. Information Agency (USIA). However, ED has always administered a relatively small part of the Fulbright-Hays Act--foreign travel and related assistance for current and prospective American teachers and professors of foreign language and international studies.

While they are divided into four programs for administrative purposes, all of the ED's Fulbright-Hays activities are aimed toward improving foreign language and international studies instruction in American schools and colleges. These activities are authorized by sec. 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act,

> promoting foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities by supporting visits and study in foreign countries by teachers and prospective teachers in such schools, colleges, and universities for the purpose of improving their skill in languages and their knowledge of the culture of the people of those countries, and by financing visits by teachers from those countries to the United States for the purpose of participating in foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities. . . .[18]

The total FY 1989 appropriation for Fulbright-Hays programs administered by ED was $5,203,000,[19] or approximately one-fifth of the

---

[18]Sec. 102(b)(6), Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended.

[19]The FY 1990 appropriation, under H.R. 3566, as passed by the House on Nov. 15, and by the Senate on Nov. 16, 1989, would also be $5,203,000.

amount appropriated for HEA title VI programs.[20] The appropriations level for ED's Fulbright-Hays programs has been essentially static since FY 1983, when the appropriation was $5,000,000. However, compared to the FY 1980 appropriation of $3,000,000, the FY 1989 amount is 73 percent higher in nominal[21] terms, although only 13 percent higher when adjusted for price level changes.[22]

Panels of nonfederal specialists review and make recommendations regarding proposals for Fulbright-Hays projects. Grantees are actually selected by a variety of organizations, including ED staff, U.S. embassies, binational commissions, and the Board of Foreign Scholarships at the USIA.[23] As with HEA title VI, grants are currently focused on non-western nations and languages that are not commonly taught in the United States. Typically, only U.S. citizens or permanent residents are eligible for these programs. Most programs cover the costs of travel abroad, maintenance allowances while abroad, plus certain tuition, research, and related charges.

The individual, currently funded Fulbright-Hays programs of the ED are briefly described below. As with HEA title VI, the ED normally has discretion to determine the allocation of Fulbright-Hays funds among these activities. Another program, Foreign Curriculum Consultants, is authorized but has not been funded since FY 1986.

The Group Projects Abroad program supports research, training, and curriculum development by groups of American educators. Participants may spend 2-12 months abroad conducting research, engaging in advanced language study, or developing curricular materials. In FY 1989, there were 38 such projects, with 1,170 participants, at a cost of $2,013,000.

---

[20]In addition to Federal appropriations, funds may provided for this program from "excess foreign currencies" in certain countries. "Excess foreign currencies" are funds paid to the United States Government by a foreign country (for example, for surplus agricultural commodities) that, as a result of some binational or international agreement, cannot be removed from the foreign country. In such cases, some of the "excess" funds may be used to finance educational activities for Americans in that nation. This situation has occurred in India in recent years; in FY 1988, 159 Americans were supported by "excess foreign currencies" while on Fulbright-Hays study trips to India.

[21]I.e., without adjustment for price level changes over this period of time.

[22]The price index used for this adjustment is the personal consumption expenditures deflator, fixed weight version, prepared by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[23]The Board of Foreign Scholarships is the primary organization involved in awarding fellowships under the larger Fulbright-Hays exchange programs administered by the USIA.

The Faculty Research Abroad program provides opportunities for faculty at American institutions of higher education to study and conduct research overseas for a 3-12 month period. In FY 1989, $692,000 was devoted to 30 grants of this type.

The Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad program assists graduate students who are preparing doctoral dissertations and intend to become teachers or professors. The fellowship provides aid for a 6-12 month period. Ninety-four persons received these grants in FY 1989, when $1,680,000 was devoted to this purpose.

Finally, Special Bilateral Projects support short term institutes, academic year seminars, and exchanges between American foreign language and international studies instructors and those in another nation. Projects were conducted in Brazil, the People's Republic of China, Egypt, India, Israel, Japan, South Korea, Italy, Pakistan, plus groups of nations in West Africa and the South Pacific in a recent year (1986-87). In FY 1989, there were 10 of these projects, for which $775,000 was budgeted.

TITLE II, PARTS B AND C, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Title II, parts B and C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by P.L. 100-297,[24] authorize two programs of aid to elementary and secondary school programs of foreign language education.[25]

---

[24]The Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988.

[25]Two previous Federal programs provided funds for elementary and secondary foreign language education, among other purposes. Title III NDEA subsidized the purchase of instructional equipment by local educational agencies (LEAs) for mathematics, science, and foreign languages. Many of the "language laboratories" that public schools initiated in the late 1950s and early 1960s were purchased with the assistance of NDEA title III grants. NDEA title III was later subsumed under broad block grant programs of ESEA title IV (1974) and ESEA title I, chapter 2 (1981). LEAs may continue to use chapter 2 funds for foreign language and international studies education, at their discretion. There is no information on the extent to which they actually do so.

Aid to foreign language education was also authorized under title II of the Education for Economic Security Act from its enactment in 1984 until its reauthorization under P.L. 100-297 in 1988. While this program supported primarily instruction in science and mathematics, LEAs were authorized to spend up to 15 percent of their grants for foreign language instruction if the

(continued...)

Thus far, neither of these programs has been funded.[26]

Part B of ESEA title II is the Foreign Language Assistance Act of 1988. This Act authorizes grants to the States for model local programs of elementary and secondary school instruction in foreign languages. Appropriations for these programs would be allocated to States on the basis of population aged 5-17 years, with a State minimum of 0.5 percent of the total grants, and 1 percent set-aside for the Outlying Areas. The Federal share of the costs of these programs is generally to be 50 percent. States are to receive grants for 2 additional years if the Secretary of Education finds that initial year grants have been used in accordance with the State's application. An appropriation of $20 million was authorized for part B for FY 1989, while "such sums as may be necessary" is authorized for FY 1990-1993.

States would grant funds to LEAs on a competitive basis. Local grant recipients would provide alternative, innovative foreign language instruction programs, serve nonpublic as well as public school pupils in the LEA, and evaluate the proficiency of participants.

Part C of ESEA title II authorizes Presidential awards to elementary and secondary teachers of foreign languages, as well as mathematics and science. The number of awards is to be 104 for foreign language teachers and 104 for mathematics and science teachers. In selecting these two groups of teachers, at least one elementary and one secondary school teacher from each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico would be chosen each year. The authorized appropriations level for part C is $2 million per fiscal year, with no more than $1 million of this amount to be used for awards to foreign language teachers. In recent years, the National Science Foundation (NSF) has made Presidential awards to elementary and secondary school teachers of

---

[25](...continued)
LEA determined that it had met its needs for teacher training in mathematics and science. A 1986 study of title II of the Education for Economic Security Act in a sample of States and LEAs found that "relatively few" LEAs used any funds for foreign language instruction. It was further found that, "[I]n some cases, states discouraged districts from" using program funds for foreign language education "because state staff were aware of the need for improving mathematics and science teaching" (Policy Studies Associates, *Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act: An Analysis of First-Year Operations*. Oct. 1986. p. vi).

[26]Both of these programs were also authorized for FY 1988 only under P.L. 100-418, the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.

science and mathematics, but no such awards have been made to teachers of foreign languages.[27]

TITLE V, LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Under title V of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), the primary Federal program of aid to public libraries, grants are authorized for the acquisition of foreign language materials. Grants are to be made on a nationally competitive basis, and no annual grant shall be for more than $15,000. The appropriations authorization level for title V is $1 million for FY 1989. Through FY 1989, no funds have been appropriated for this title, which was added to the LSCA in 1984 (P.L. 98-480). Although LSCA title V is currently authorized only through FY 1989, legislation to extend its authorization through FY 1994, with few amendments, has recently been passed by the House and the Senate.[28]

SOVIET-EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES PROGRAM

As noted earlier, several Federal agencies--for example, the Department of Defense, Department of State, Central Intelligence Agency, etc.,--conduct a variety of foreign language and international studies programs that are excluded from this report because they are generally limited to instruction of employees of those agencies. However, there are two foreign language and international studies programs administered outside of the U.S. Department of Education that make grants to colleges and universities in general; one of these is the Soviet-East European Studies program of the Department of State.

This program was initially authorized by title VIII of P.L. 98-164, the Soviet-East European Research and Training Act of 1983. This Act establishes a Soviet-East European Studies Advisory Committee, consisting of the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Education, plus other individuals. The Advisory Committee is to recommend grant policies and recipients for this program. The initial authorization levels were set at $5 million for each of FY 1984 and 1985. The FY 1989 appropriation was $4.6 million. The legislation provides for its termination 10 years after the date of enactment, which was November 22, 1983.

---

[27]These awards have been funded from appropriations made to the NSF for Science and Engineering Education, and have not been based on the authorization in ESEA title II, part C.

[28]H.R. 2742 was passed by the House on Sept. 12, 1989, and by the Senate on Oct. 12, 1989. It is currently being considered by a conference committee.

Funds appropriated for the Soviet-East European Studies program are to be used for the following specified activities, among others:

- a national postdoctoral research program,
- graduate and postdoctoral teaching fellowships,
- research on the use of available data on the Soviet Union and East European nations,
- seminars and conferences to facilitate cooperation between Federal Government and private specialists,
- advanced training and research in the Soviet Union and East European nations, and
- training in Russian and East European languages.

In general, institutions of higher education and private, nonprofit research organizations are eligible for grants under this program. In FY 1989, grants were made to one institution of higher education and to nine other organizations that included public research agencies (e.g., the Woodrow Wilson Center of the Smithsonian Institution), professional associations (e.g., American Council of Teachers of Russian, or the Joint Committee on Soviet Studies of the Social Sciences Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies), and international exchange organizations (e.g., the International Research and Exchanges Board). In general, only a small share of funds under this program have been granted directly to institutions of higher education, although many of the other funds are used to provide fellowships to individual graduate students and professors.

Clearly, the functions of this program are similar to those of title VI of the Higher Education Act and the Fulbright-Hays programs administered by the Department of Education, but with specific reference to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The major differences between this State Department program and those administered by ED are the Soviet-East European program's emphasis on postdoctoral studies; plus the emphasis in grant-making on institutions other than colleges and universities, and ultimately on providing fellowships for individual research and travel by graduate students and professors.

The functions of this program are similar to those of title VI of the Higher Education Act and the Fulbright-Hays programs administered by the Department of Education, but with specific reference to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

While the selection of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as the only foreign region for such a program might have seemed questionable to some in the past, this is unlikely to be questioned today, given the rapidly changing conditions in that region. However, certain other questions might be raised with respect to the Soviet-East European Studies program. Why should this program be administered by the Department of State, while other foreign language and international studies programs making grants to American institutions of higher education are administered by the Department of Education? Alternatively, with its somewhat different emphasis, is this program a complement to HEA title VI and Fulbright-Hays, a model that should be copied for other major foreign areas of special interest (e.g., East Asia, Africa)?

JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

The final non-ED program included in this report is the Japan-United States Friendship Commission. The Commission is an independent, executive branch agency that supports educational exchanges, Japanese studies programs in the United States and American studies programs in Japan, policy research, arts exhibitions and exchange programs, and public education activities in both the United States and Japan. The Commission was established in 1975 by the Japan-United States Friendship Act, P.L. 94-118.

Funds are provided by both the United States and Japanese governments, with the Japanese contribution being somewhat higher in recent years. In FY 1989, the Commission's total budget authority was $3.115 million, with $1.415 million of this coming from the United States Government and $1.7 million from the Japanese government.

While grants are made by the Japan-United States Friendship Commission to a variety of organizations and institutions, a large proportion of them are made to institutions of higher education, both in the United States and Japan. For example, grants made by the Commission to American institutions in FY 1988 included:

- aid to universities for Japanese language education programs, including development of instructional materials for use at the high school level,
- grants to university and other libraries to expand their collections of Japanese materials,
- fellowships for graduate and professional students in fields related to Japan,
- faculty exchange programs, and
- grants to universities and other institutions for research projects.

Aid is also provided to a number of Japanese universities to support educational exchanges and American studies programs. Other activities of the Commission, which generally do not directly support institutions of higher education, include public affairs programs, frequently conducted by State or regional Japan-America societies, artist exchange programs, and artistic exhibitions or performances.[29]

As with the Soviet-East European Studies program of the Department of State, a major issue regarding the Japan-United States Friendship Commission is whether there should be a specific agency conducting programs on a single foreign area that are similar to worldwide programs of ED, the USIA, and other Federal agencies. The Commission supports foreign language and international studies programs in universities that are similar to those under HEA title VI, plus educational and artistic exchange programs similar to those of the USIA. While the Commission apparently attempts to coordinate its activities with related programs of other Federal agencies, it may be questioned whether a separate agency devoted to Japanese programs is an efficient use of Federal funds.

Unique characteristics of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission include the substantial contributions made to it by the Japanese government, and the relatively wide variety of institutions and programs it aids, in both this Nation and Japan. The Commission's programs are also relatively inexpensive, with United States appropriations of less than $1.5 million in recent years.

Unique characteristics of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission include the substantial contributions made by the Japanese government, and the relatively wide variety of institutions and programs it aids, in both this Nation and Japan.

[29]U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies. *Hearings on Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1990.* Part 5. p. 589-636.

THE CONTEXT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Critiques of both the quantity and quality of American education in foreign languages are commonplace.[30] Both individual analysts and study commissions have frequently concluded that the foreign language requirements and offerings of American educational institutions fall well below those in other major nations, as well as below the level required for economic competitiveness and educational excellence. This report section discusses the context in which these critiques have evolved.

Critiques of both the quantity and quality of American education in foreign languages are commonplace.

It is difficult to prove the validity of these assertions. There is no precise way to determine the amount of foreign language instruction, or the level of competence, that is required in order to meet the demands of the economy or to be a well-educated individual. Beyond the relatively concrete needs of Federal Government agencies, institutions of higher education, and certain international business firms for specialists in foreign language and international studies, the "appropriate" level of support for foreign language education may be more a function of subjective preferences than of "need."

Traditional justifications for foreign language and international studies are that instruction in these subjects will:

- increase understanding of linguistic forms and rules in general,
- stimulate appreciation of foreign nations and cultures,
- through comparison and contrast with English, increase understanding of one's own language,

---

[30]Among the many titles that could be cited here are: *America's Crisis in International Competence, Our Nation's Failure to Educate Students for the Future*, by the American Institute for Foreign Study (1983), *What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us, The Shortfall in International Competence*, by the Commission on International Education, American Council on Education (1984), and *Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action*, by the National Advisory Board on International Education Programs (1983).

- be of practical value in communicating with foreign visitors and recent immigrants, or when travelling abroad,
- increase the individual's employability, particularly for careers involving foreign travel or communication with foreign trading partners, and
- increase the Nation's security and trade competitiveness.

Arguments in favor of foreign language study were summarized in the 1983 U.S. Department of Education study, *A Nation at Risk*, in the following statement:

> We believe it is desirable that students achieve [such] proficiency because study of a foreign language introduces students to non-English-speaking cultures, heightens awareness and comprehension of one's native tongue, and serves the Nation's needs in commerce, diplomacy, defense, and education. (p. 26)

COMPARISONS TO OTHER NATIONS

Proponents of expanded foreign language and international studies education in the United States often state that the number of courses taken, and the level of competence, is much higher among the students of other developed nations. While this may be true, it is difficult to prove. The only major assessment of foreign language competence of American students versus those of other nations was conducted almost two decades ago, and considered only high school students of French.[31]

Regarding foreign language course participation in other nations, consistent and current data covering a wide range of nations are not available. Especially problematic are inconsistencies between and even within nations regarding the amount of actual instructional time and content that a "year" of a foreign language course constitutes, and differences in course

---

[31]As part of its "first round" of multinational assessments of educational achievement in several subject areas during the early 1970s, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) conducted an assessment of secondary school student knowledge of French as a foreign language. Separate tests were administered in French reading comprehension, writing, listening comprehension, and speaking; and two age levels of pupils were tested (14 and 17 year olds). Only the United States plus 4-7 other nations (the number of participating nations varied according to each of the 4 separate tests and 2 age levels), such as the Netherlands and Sweden, participated in this assessment. The scores for American students were generally average to below average among these nations for 14 year old pupils, and were consistently well below average for 17 year olds.

requirements for students in "academic" versus "vocational" or other secondary school programs. Nevertheless, it does seem clear that several other developed nations require all, or at least a very substantial proportion, of their students to receive more foreign language instruction than is received by all but a small proportion of American students. For example, in Sweden all pupils must take English courses each year from grades 4 through 9, and college preparatory plus some vocational students in upper secondary school must take English plus another foreign language.[32] In the Soviet Union, all students take foreign languages in each of grades 5-11, although the classes need be held for only 1 hour per week during the last 3 years.[33] Finally, academic program secondary students in Japan, who constitute about 70 percent of all secondary students, are required to take a minimum of 2 years of English in upper secondary school (grades 10-12), although many take additional English classes, as well as another foreign language. This is in addition to 3 years of English that are taken by most pupils in lower secondary school (grades 7-9).[34]

Several other developed nations require most or all of their students to receive more foreign language instruction than is received by all but a tiny proportion of American students.

RECENT EDUCATIONAL POLICY REPORTS ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Over the last decade, numerous commissions or other organizations have released reports recommending large increases in attention and resources devoted to foreign language and international studies at all levels of education. The major findings and recommendations of some of the most significant or recent reports are summarized below.

Over the last decade, numerous commissions or other organizations have released reports recommending large increases in attention and resources devoted to foreign language and international studies at all levels of education.

In 1979, a Presidentially appointed Commission on Foreign

---

[32] Stenholm, Britta. *The Swedish School System*, The Swedish Institute, 1984. p. 87-89.

[33] Muckle, James. *A Guide to the Soviet Curriculum: What the Russian Child is Taught in School*. 1988. p. 152.

[34] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. *Japanese Education Today*, 1987. p. 34 and 43.

Language and International Studies published *Strength Through Wisdom, A Critique of U.S. Capability*. The authors of this report found that Americans' relative ignorance of foreign languages and cultures was a primary cause of a decline in economic competitiveness, foreign policy difficulties, and public misunderstanding of international issues. The Commission made numerous recommendations, including the following:

- high schools and institutions of higher education should expand foreign language and international studies requirements for admission and graduation,
- ED should provide *per capita* incentive grants for schools and colleges to increase foreign language and international studies enrollments,
- ED should support the establishment of summer foreign language institutes, regional centers for teacher training and retraining, research on foreign language instructional methods, magnet schools specializing in foreign language and international studies, plus expansion of all of the current programs under HEA title VI and the Fulbright-Hays Act,
- a national network should be developed for sharing foreign language and other foreign books and periodicals,
- an interagency Federal Council on International Research and Training should be established,
- the international educational exchange programs of the USIA and other organizations should be expanded, including extension of the Fulbright program to undergraduate students, and
- linkages between foreign language and international studies programs and business should be enhanced.

Some of these recommendations were reflected in amendments to HEA title VI in 1980 and 1986, such as establishment of the Business and International Education programs, although most of them have not been carried out.

A number of more recent reports on the curriculum of American elementary and secondary schools have recommended increased emphasis on foreign language and international studies. As is discussed in a later section of this report, *A Nation at Risk*, published by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983, recommended a minimum of 2 years of foreign language education for all high school students planning to attend a postsecondary educational institution, and further supported the notion that students should take 4-6 years of foreign language instruction in order to become proficient. A 1987 report by the National Endowment for the Humanities, *American Memory*, noted a recent increase in foreign language

course enrollment in secondary schools (see below), but decried the "practical, vocational" approach to much of this language study. The report recommended that students should be taught foreign languages beginning in elementary school, and that this instruction should focus on "the history, literature, and thought of other nations" (p. 28). Finally, the *James Madison High School* model curriculum published by the Secretary of Education in 1987 included a minimum of 2 years of foreign language study for all students, with further foreign language study "strongly" recommended.

More recently, the Task Force on International Education of the National Governors Association (NGA) released *America in Transition, The International Frontier* (1989). This report focuses primarily on economic issues, especially an increasing internationalization of the American economy as trade barriers fall in many areas of the world (the free trade agreement between the United States and Canada, the unification of the economies of the Common Market nations of Western Europe in 1992, etc.). The NGA argues that the States should act to meet the challenge of these economic developments by enhancing foreign language and international studies at all levels of education. Major barriers to expansion of foreign language and international studies programs were identified as including: inadequate numbers of elementary and secondary foreign language teachers, and frequently inadequate preparation of existing foreign language teachers; elementary and secondary textbooks that have become "simplified" and "less substantive"; inadequate student assessment methods; limited resources for foreign language and international studies; and insufficient international and foreign language expertise in the business sector.

The NGA report recommends that States act to meet the objectives of: making international education a part of the basic education of all students; increasing foreign language and international studies course offerings at all levels of education; increasing teacher competence and instructional resources in foreign language and international studies; establishing or increasing foreign language and international studies course requirements for college students; and increasing business support of, and access to, international expertise. At least partially in response to these recommendations,[35] the Virginia State Education Superintendent and Secretary recently proposed increasing the State's high school graduation requirements, placing greater emphasis on foreign language and international studies.[36] Under this proposal, all high school students would work toward either an "advanced studies" or a "applied academics" (vocational) diploma. The advanced studies diploma would require 4 years of foreign language education plus 1-year courses in world studies and international trade, while two years of foreign

---

[35]The Governor of Virginia was head of the NGA Task Force on International Education.

[36]*Virginia Proposes Overhaul of High School.* Washington Post, Oct. 14, 1989. p. A1, A11.

language or computer applications would be required for the applied academics diploma.[37]

Earlier this year the American Council on Education (ACE), which represents a wide variety of higher education interests, recommended that all institutions of higher education require students to take foreign language courses in secondary school, and require graduates to be able to demonstrate competence in one or more foreign languages before receiving their degrees.[38] The recommended policies would allow only those with inadequate opportunities for foreign language study in high school, or with specific learning disabilities, to be exempted from the foreign language requirements. Finally, the National Endowment for the Humanities recently recommended that 2 years of foreign language instruction be included as part of a core curriculum to be required of all undergraduate students.[39]

RESISTANCE TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Since American foreign language participation and competence have been regularly decried for many years, and no State currently requires that all students must complete any foreign language courses before graduating,[40] there would appear to be substantial disinterest in, or resistance to, such instruction. Some of the possible reasons for this resistance include:

- this is a largely, although certainly not wholly, monolingual nation, which reduces the immediate practical benefits of foreign language acquisition,
- the United States is physically large, surrounded mostly by water and a largely English-speaking neighbor, so that most Americans do not find themselves located close to the border of a foreign nation with a different language,
- the use of the foreign language that is probably most frequently spoken in the United States, and that is dominant in our most

---

[37]The Virginia State Board of Education has not yet taken action on this proposal.

[38]*ACE Calls for Foreign Language Competency for College Graduates.* American Council on Education news release, July 14, 1989.

[39]National Endowment for the Humanities. *50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students.* Oct. 1989.

[40]Some local school districts have such a requirement, as does the District of Columbia.

populous foreign neighbor--Spanish--has at times been discouraged in United States schools and other institutions, at least as a primary language, reducing the motivation of some English speakers to learn the language,

- as a nation of immigrants, most of whose ancestors came from non-English speaking nations, we have in the past displayed mixed attitudes toward the languages of our ancestry, frequently neglecting these as English was adopted,

- it is widely perceived that English is becoming a "world language," understood by key persons engaged in commerce and transportation around the globe,

- some Americans appear to have developed a negative attitude toward foreign language courses--that they are "difficult," "boring," or "irrelevant"--because they took the courses primarily to meet a requirement for high school or college graduation, college admission, or to qualify for a graduate degree, and

- occasionally, some individuals oppose at least certain forms of foreign language or international studies because they fear that such courses espouse a world view that is excessively "internationalist" or "one-worldly," and that does not sufficiently account for the traditional values or virtues of the United States.[41]

---

[41] *Selling Globaloney in the Schools*. The American Spectator, Dec. 1988. p. 22-26. *Leaders of 'Global Education' Institutes Deny Advocating Radical Political Ideas*. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Apr. 23, 1986. p. 13, 18. According to one opponent of certain elementary and secondary international education programs, Ms. Jeannie Fortin of California Citizens for Excellence in Education, who is quoted in the latter article, such programs are "leading youngsters to get rid of their ideas of national sovereignty and American traditional values."

Thus, there has long been a gap in judgement regarding the importance and value of foreign language and international studies between professional educators and others who tend to place high value on such education, versus student populations, who often appear to view such courses as uninteresting or "irrelevant." It is within this general context that recent pronouncements about, and trends in, foreign language and international studies may be considered.

There has long been a gap in judgement regarding the importance and value of foreign language and international studies between professional educators and others who tend to place high value on such education, versus student populations, who often appear to view such courses as uninteresting or "irrelevant".

FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: COURSE PARTICIPATION AND DEGREES EARNED

The following section of this report provides statistics on trends in foreign language and international studies courses taken and degrees earned by students at secondary and higher education institutions. With the exception of secondary school courses taken, these data indicate that participation in foreign language instruction has declined greatly over the past 20 years.

With the exception of secondary school courses taken, these data indicate that participation in foreign language instruction has declined greatly over the past 20 years

Consistent statistics on foreign language and international studies course participation are difficult to obtain at either the elementary and secondary or postsecondary education levels. Data are usually limited to foreign language courses and degrees, not including international studies. This is due largely to unresolved variations and ambiguities in the ways that international studies courses and degrees are identified by different educational institutions. For individual courses, it is often impossible to distinguish between an "international studies" course and a "general curriculum" course that has an international focus.

Elementary and Secondary Education

ED collects data on foreign language course participation by secondary, but not elementary, school students, largely because foreign language study

by American elementary pupils is generally considered to be uncommon.[42] The secondary student participation data indicate a steady decline in the proportion of all secondary students who were enrolled in foreign language courses between 1965 and 1978, but a relatively sharp increase between 1965 and 1985.

TABLE 2. Percentage of Secondary School Students Who Are Enrolled In One or More Foreign Language Courses

Selected years, 1965 through 1985[a]

Year	Percentage of secondary students
1965	31.5
1970	28.3
1976	22.2
1978	22.7
1982	23.3
1985	32.2

[a]Source: U.S. department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. *Digest of Education Statistics, 1988.* p. 61. Similar trends are reflected in data compiled for the *Report on Foreign Language Enrollment in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1985,* by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

[42]According to the NGA report, *America in Transition, The International Frontier*, only 17 percent of American elementary schools offer any form of foreign language instruction.

Enrollments in secondary level foreign language courses appear to have substantially risen in recent years, reversing a long-term decline.

It is difficult to explain such a large increase over a period of only 3 years (1982-85) in the percentage of secondary students who were enrolled in foreign language courses. If these data are to be considered reliable, one possible explanation is the wave of changes in State requirements for high school graduation that swept over virtually all of the States in the years immediately following the publication of *A Nation at Risk*[43] and several other education "reform" reports in 1983. These reports frequently recommended substantial foreign language and/or international studies be taken at least by students planning to enter postsecondary education.[44] While no State required all high school graduates to complete any foreign language or international studies courses, several States established or extended criteria for awarding special "academic" or "college preparatory" diplomas during this period, with 2 or more years of foreign language education typically required for these diplomas.[45] In addition, a few colleges and universities raised their foreign language course requirements for admission during the middle 1980's (see below). These developments might have combined to substantially increase foreign language course-taking by high school students in recent years. This would also imply an increase in demand for foreign language teachers by secondary schools.

Postsecondary Education

Long term trend data on foreign language or international studies course requirements of postsecondary educational institutions are not available.

---

[43]U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence in Education.

[44]For example, while foreign languages were not included among the "new basics" in the curriculum suggested for all pupils in *A Nation at Risk*, the authors of that report stated that, "[F]or the college-bound, 2 years of foreign language in high school are strongly recommended in addition to those taken earlier" (p. 24). It was further stated that, "[A]chieving proficiency in a foreign language ordinarily requires from 4 to 6 years of study and should, therefore, be started in the early grades" (p. 26).

[45]According to *State Educational Standards in the 50 States: An Update* (March 1988), by Margaret E. Goertz of the Educational Testing Service, seven States have established special "college preparatory" high school diplomas requiring at least 2-3 years of foreign language courses. Five other States have specified course requirements for all students in college preparatory "track" to include 2-3 years of foreign language instruction.

However, a 1988 report prepared for ACE examined foreign language and international studies course requirements for admission and graduation (bachelor's level) at a nationally representative sample of American colleges.[46] The author of this report found that only 16 percent of 4-year colleges have any foreign language or international studies requirements for admission. Even among major research universities, a minority of 37 percent have such a requirement for some or all of their students, usually the completion of 2 years or more of foreign language courses.[47]

The proportion of 4-year colleges requiring the completion of foreign language or international studies courses, typically 2-4 semesters, for graduation with a bachelor's degree is higher. According to the ACE report, about two-thirds of institutions have such requirements for at least some of their students (depending on their major field of study), although only one-sixth have such requirements for all students.[48] Major fields of study where foreign language and international studies courses are most often required are the humanities and social sciences. In addition, about three-fourths of 4-year colleges report having general education requirements for graduation that include international studies -- for example, courses in world history. Finally, it was found that about 8 percent of 4-year colleges had increased their foreign language requirements for admission during the previous 5 years, while 16 percent had increased their foreign language and international studies requirements for graduation. A number of colleges appear to have dropped foreign language and international studies graduation requirements sometime during the late 1960s or the 1970s, but to have revived such requirements in recent years.

Data on the rate of modern[49] foreign language (but not international studies) course participation by postsecondary students are available for 1960

---

[46] Anderson, Charles J. *International Studies for Undergraduates, 1987, Operations and Opinions.*

[47]Another survey, based upon a different sample of higher educational institutions, found that 26 percent of 4-year colleges in the United States had foreign language entrance requirements, typically 2 years of high school study, in 1987-88. *The MLA Survey of Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements, 1987-88.* ADFL Bulletin, Jan. 1989. p. 17.

[48]Another survey, conducted in 1988-89 for the National Endowment for the Humanities (*50 Hours, A Core Curriculum for College Students*, p. 8), found that it was possible to earn a bachelor's degree at an estimated 77 percent of American colleges without taking any foreign language courses.

[49]I.e., languages such as classical Greek and Latin are excluded.

through 1986.[60] These data indicate that aggregate participation in foreign language courses has declined by more than half in terms of the **percentage** of all students who are enrolled in these courses. While 16.1 percent of all students in institutions of higher education were enrolled in foreign language courses in 1960, only 7.8 percent were enrolled in such courses in 1986. As with enrollment in secondary school foreign language courses, the 1986 level is slightly above the percentages for the early 1980s (7.3 percent in 1980). The **number** of postsecondary students enrolled in modern foreign language courses was found to have declined more modestly, from 1,067,217 in 1968 to 960,588 in 1986. This survey did find that course participation has substantially increased in certain languages, particularly Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese.

Postsecondary course participation and degrees earned in foreign languages have declined sharply since the 1960s.

Data on degrees earned in foreign languages (but not international studies) are available over an extended period of time. These indicate a decline since the late 1960s at the bachelor's and master's levels, and since the early 1970s at the doctoral level, as shown in the following table.

TABLE 3. Postsecondary Degrees Awarded In Foreign Languages By American Colleges And Universities, Selected Years, 1967-68 Through 1985-86*

	Degrees awarded		
Academic year	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
1967-68	17,499	3,911	491
1969-70	19,457	4,154	590
1972-73	18,234	3,994	891
1977-78	12,449	2,658	636
1982-83	9,335	1,605	454
1985-86	9,810	1,656	427

*Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1988*, p. 234.

[60]Brod, Richard I. *Foreign Language Enrollments in US Institutions of Higher Education. Fall 1986.*

Thus, there has been substantial reduction in the number of persons earning postsecondary degrees specifically in foreign languages over the past 20 years, although the 1985-86 figures are slightly above those for 1982-83 at the bachelor's and master's levels. While, as noted earlier, there is no generally agreed upon way in which to determine how many individuals with this level of training are "needed," these data would at least indicate that any shortage that might have existed in foreign language specialists seems likely to have worsened in recent years. A recent report by the Joint National Committee for Languages[61] found that 57 percent of State education agencies (SEAs) are experiencing a shortage of foreign language teachers at either the elementary or secondary level, and 69 percent anticipate such shortages over the next 5 years. Another recent survey by the NGA found 26 States reporting shortages of elementary or secondary teachers of foreign languages.[62] However, these surveys are largely subjective. As with many surveys of teacher supply and demand, data sources are inadequate to apply rigorous consistency in defining what a "shortage" means.

Another recent study, *Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences: A Study of Factors Affecting Demand and Supply 1987-2012*, attempts to forecast supply and demand in the employment market for college and university professors over the next 13 years.[63] The authors of this report, William G. Bowen and Julie Ann Sosa, argue that over this period, the aggregate demand for new college and university instructors will substantially exceed the projected number of persons earning Ph.D. degrees and other candidates for employment in these positions. They estimate that currently, there are 1.6 qualified candidates for every teaching position available at institutions of higher education, but that this ratio will fall to 0.8 by 1997. This results from projected increases in postsecondary education enrollments by the late 1990s, plus the retirement of many faculty members who entered the profession during the enrollment boom of the 1960s. While this report does not include projections specifically for professors of foreign language and international studies, it does forecast that shortages will be greatest in the humanities and social sciences, fields that include most foreign language and area studies professors. Among the reasons cited for this projection is a general decline in Federal support for graduate fellowships (again, without specific reference to those under HEA title VI).

---

[61]Draper, Jamie B. *State Activities Update: Focus on the Teacher*. Dec. 1988.

[62]*America in Transition, The International Frontier*, p. 5.

[63]In addition to the report, see *Shortage Seen For Faculties For the 1990's*. New York times, Sept. 13, 1989. p. A1, B10.

OPTIONS FOR FEDERAL POLICY REGARDING FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Having reviewed the currently authorized forms of Federal aid to foreign language and international studies, recommendations for expansion of such education--whether funded by the Federal Government or other sources-- and recent trends in degrees and course participation, this report concludes with a consideration of, "Where do we go from here"? Selected options for future Federal policy in foreign language and international studies education are briefly analyzed. These options are:

- terminate all special Federal support for foreign language and international studies,
- maintain or moderately increase the current level of Federal funding for foreign language and international studies education, but consider reallocating these resources to better meet present needs, and
- consolidate and substantially expand Federal aid to foreign language and international studies education through establishment of a foundation or endowment.

Throughout this section, the primary focus will be on HEA title VI, because this is the largest, broadest, and most flexible Federal program of support for foreign language and international studies. Except where it is explicitly stated otherwise, title VI is employed as a proxy for Federal support of foreign language and international studies education from all sources. In other cases, specific reference will be made to other Federal aid programs, either current or proposed.

TERMINATE ALL SPECIAL FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Rationale for Termination of Federal Aid

This option is discussed first because resolution of the question of whether the Federal Government should support foreign language and international studies education at all precedes consideration of options that maintain or expand the Federal role in this area. In favor of terminating all specific Federal aid to foreign language and international studies education, the following points could be emphasized:

- participation in high school foreign language courses has increased substantially in recent years, without the provision of significant Federal aid for foreign language or international studies education at this level,
- as noted earlier, direct Federal aid, under HEA title VI, represents less than 10 percent of foreign language and international studies

program budgets on average, so elimination of these funds might have relatively little effect,

- during the 1950s and 1960s, certain major philanthropic foundations --especially the Ford and Carnegie Foundations--provided substantial support to foreign language and international studies programs at several universities; if Federal aid were eliminated, these foundations might be willing to make up for the loss of Federal aid,

- while the Federal Government does need specialists in certain foreign language and international studies areas, it has facilities to train most of those it needs,

- past research on the FLAS fellowship program indicates that a large percentage of graduates did not obtain employment commensurate with their specialized training,

- while export oriented businesses may appreciate the information services provided by international business programs at institutions of higher education, the businesses should be willing to pay more of the costs of these services themselves, rather than being indirectly subsidized by an ED program, and

- foreign language and international studies students are eligible for a wide range of Federal and other grant and loan programs that are open to undergraduate and graduate students in any subject area; many feel that students' major area of study should be left to individual choice and labor market forces, not influenced by Federal programs that reduce student costs in a particular subject area.

Many feel that students' major area of study should be left to individual choice and labor market forces, not influenced by Federal programs in a particular subject area.

Such arguments would support the termination of current Federal aid to foreign language and international studies education.

Reasons to Continue Federal Support for Foreign Language and International Studies

The primary counter to the above arguments is that the Federal Government has a "special responsibility" to support education in these subjects. The Federal Government is the primary level of government involved in international relations--diplomacy, defense, and international trade. Thus, the Federal Government has both a broad concern about Americans'

level of knowledge regarding the languages and cultures of other nations, and a more concrete and specific need for knowledgeable specialists in these subjects who can conduct international affairs. The Federal Government should also be especially concerned about the performance of the American economy in international trade, and the ability of American firms to compete in foreign markets.

The Federal Government has both a broad concern about Americans' level of knowledge regarding the languages and cultures of other nations, and a more concrete and specific need for knowledgeable specialists in these subjects who can conduct international affairs.

The broad objectives of educating the American public about international issues, and informing American businesses about foreign markets, cannot be performed by the Federal Government alone, but through our extensive network of educational institutions. Even the task of educating Federal specialists more broadly has not been, and probably could not be, wholly performed by Federal schools, because of the wide variety of necessary languages and subjects, and the occasionally rapid shifts in priority world areas. This is a major rationale for continued Federal support of a network of university resource centers in "critical" and/or "uncommonly taught" foreign languages.

While the university centers of foreign language and international studies might continue to operate without specific Federal aid, and some of the lost aid might be recovered through increased foundation grants, it is also possible that continuation of the title VI program is a relatively low cost way to ensure that the centers are maintained, and their evolution is influenced by changes in Federal requirements. In making title VI grants, especially to national resource centers, ED attempts to support centers covering all regions of the world, and to emphasize instruction in languages not commonly taught in the United States. Without title VI grants or similar Federal aid, there would be less assurance that these centers and instructional programs would exist.

Proponents of the title VI program argue further that title VI grants actually help to attract foundation and other grants to foreign language and international studies programs, by indicating the national priority placed on such instruction, rather than Federal aid acting to replace private funds. However, it appears that some of the largest foundation grants to foreign language and international studies programs at universities were made before the enactment of title VI, not in response to title VI.[54] Perhaps the current foundation funds, whatever their aggregate amount, are simply attracted to the specific institutions that tend to receive title VI grants.

---

[54]McCaughey, Robert A. *International Studies and Academic Enterprise.*

There are more specific reasons to support Federal aid to such a subject area as foreign language and international studies. Programs for uncommon languages are likely to be too small to be justified without outside support from Federal or other sources. Similarly, the development of instructional materials in uncommon languages is unlikely to be provided by individual institutions of higher education or States. The cost to the individual State or institution would be too high relative to the small number of students who would benefit from instructional materials in rare languages. Even the aggregate market is likely to be too small to attract the attention of commercial publishers. In such cases, Federal aid--or at least support from some outside, national source--is justified, at least when the languages are not only uncommon but deemed to be "critical" to our defense or economic interests.

Analogous arguments can be made in support of Federal aid to research on foreign language instruction. However, in this case State and institutional incentives to invest their funds are low not because few of their students would benefit, but because students throughout the nation (and perhaps beyond) would benefit from the findings of well conceived research activities. Therefore, as with much research from which the broad public benefits, funding should be shared on a national basis to reflect the national interest in obtaining research results. Some research on foreign language instruction is currently conducted at institutions of higher education assisted under HEA title VI, and under the auspices of the National Foreign Language Center, located in Washington, D.C., and affiliated with the Johns Hopkins University.[55] ED's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) has also indicated an intention to support a new National Center for the Learning and Teaching of Foreign Language during FY 1990, if sufficient funds are available.[56]

---

[55]The National Foreign Language Center is funded primarily by foundation grants. It conducts and supports research and policy studies on foreign language instruction, provides a limited number of fellowships to senior scholars in this area, and convenes meetings devoted to selected aspects of foreign language education.

[56]U.S. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies. *Departments of Labor Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1990. Part 6. Department of Education*. p. 1460.

MAINTAIN OR MODERATELY INCREASE THE CURRENT LEVEL OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION, BUT CONSIDER REALLOCATING THESE RESOURCES TO BETTER MEET PRESENT NEEDS

If specific Federal aid to foreign language and international studies education is to be continued, attention shifts to the most effective level and nature of such support. Alternatives for substantially increasing Federal aid are considered in the last section of this report; this section considers how the current level of funding might be redistributed in order to better meet current needs. The maintenance of both the current funding level and the current allocation of funds among specific programs is, of course, another option available to policymakers, but this will not be discussed further in this report.

In this section, we will not discuss all possible combinations of funds allocation in detail, because these are infinite. Rather, we will focus on specific programs that might be considered for increases or decreases from their current funding level.

As noted earlier, HEA title VI is one of the relatively few ED programs for which the Congress typically appropriates funds without specifying the distribution of the appropriation among individual programs. In exercising this discretion, ED generally follows the pattern of giving each title VI program a similar share of the total title VI appropriation as it has received in the past. ED usually has not initiated funding for new title VI authorizations in recent years. Thus, the result of current ED and congressional practices is a relatively static situation, with each title VI program receiving the same share of a slowly growing "pot" of title VI funds each year, with the Congress occasionally directing ED to begin funding of a particular new authorization, such as the Centers for International Business Education in FY 1989. While this pattern has the virtue of providing stable support, it does not respond well to changing priorities as reflected in amendments to the authorizing statute, or to possibly changing needs.

While the current funding pattern for foreign language and international studies has the virtue of providing stable support, it does not respond well to changing priorities or to possibly changing needs.

Areas that Might be Considered for Increased Support

To fervent proponents of Federal aid to foreign language and international studies, all currently authorized, and some not yet authorized, program areas are worthy of substantially increased support. However, in this section it is assumed that total Federal funding for foreign language and

international studies remains essentially constant. Therefore, only a few currently authorized programs can be considered. Programs are listed in this section because they have been recently authorized by Congress but never funded or, if already funded, because they are intended to meet needs emphasized by recent research or participation trends. The programs in this category include:

- three programs added to HEA title VI in 1986 but never funded--Grants to Higher Educational Institutions With Substantial Foreign Language Course Participation and Requirements, Intensive Summer Language Institutes, and Periodicals Published Outside the United States;

- the authorization for aid to elementary and secondary school foreign language programs, added to the ESEA in 1988 as title II, parts B and C;

- aid for the purchase of foreign language periodicals under title V of the LSCA; and

- two programs currently funded under HEA title VI--Foreign Language and International Studies Research Projects plus Business and International Education.

Of the unfunded authorizations in HEA title VI, that for Intensive Summer Language Institutes might be of particular interest, because of the limited number of such institutes currently available, and the instructional value of full-time immersion in a foreign language environment. These institutes would be available to both advanced foreign language students and to teachers. While the other two unfunded HEA title VI programs would serve significant needs, eligibility for the grants might be so widespread that funds to any particular institution would be too small to provide substantial services or constitute a meaningful incentive to increase foreign language requirements. This concern also applies to the LSCA title V program, which has a total authorization of only $1 million and a maximum grant size of $15,000.

The provision of appropriations for the new title II, parts B and C of the ESEA would renew Federal support for elementary and secondary foreign language education. The Federal Government has not provided significant, direct aid in this area since the demise of title III of the NDEA in 1974. Grants would be made to all States by formula, but grantees within States would be selected competitively to "model" programs, which might prevent an ineffective dispersion of the funds. Funding for this program could indicate the special Federal concern for foreign language and international studies education and, by aiding and evaluating innovative programs, complement the renewed interest in elementary and secondary foreign language education. Grants might be used to enhance the skills of teachers, an area of particular concern, especially in a period of rising elementary and secondary enrollments in foreign language courses. This program might also help to spread foreign

language education at the elementary or even prekindergarten levels, at which it is infrequently provided today.

An alternative to funding the current authorization for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education in foreign language and international studies would be adoption of one of the proposals that have been introduced in the 101st Congress.[57] Bills have been proposed that would authorize a variety of forms of aid, including inservice and preservice teacher training, support of consortia offering elementary and secondary instruction in foreign languages, and "distance learning"[58] demonstrations to sparsely populated areas. Thus far, no formal action has been taken on these bills, other than hearings.[59]

Finally, two HEA title VI programs that are now funded might be considered for additional support. As evidenced by the additional authorization for International Business Education Centers by the 100th Congress, and general congressional and national interest in international trade competitiveness, there is widespread support for the Business and International Education program. This program received $2.3 million in FY 1989, and its funding level has remained static for several years (the FY 1985 amount was $2.2 million). Institutions of higher education that receive these grants not only provide joint educational programs in business plus foreign language or international studies; they also provide a variety of services to American businesses interested in increasing their exports. The other title VI Program, Foreign Language and International Studies Research Projects, helps to provide instructional materials--often very basic ones, such as grammar texts, where these have not been available--for languages that are not commonly taught in the United States. Once produced, these materials can be used by institutions of higher education throughout the nation, and therefore can have a broad impact in relation to their cost.

Areas that Might be Considered for Decreased Support

If the current level of aggregate Federal support for foreign language and international studies is to be continued, then increases in some program areas imply decreases in others. A few currently funded programs that might be considered for decreases are discussed below. Programs are listed in this

---

[57]These 101st Congress bills include the Critical Languages and Area Studies Program Assistance Act (S. 1540 and H.R. 3258), and the Foreign Language Competence for the Future Act of 1989 (introduced in two somewhat different versions as S. 1690 and H.R. 2188).

[58]I.e., dissemination of instruction through satellite or other telecommunications.

[59]The Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities held a hearing on S. 1690 on Oct. 31, 1989.

section because they at least partially duplicate other Federal programs, have funding levels that are high relative to the numbers of institutions or individuals receiving assistance, or provide a disproportionate amount of funds for education regarding a single region of the world. The currently funded programs that might be considered for decreases include:

- two programs under HEA title VI--FLAS Fellowships ($7,550,000) and Centers for International Business Education ($741,000), and
- the Fulbright-Hays Act programs administered by the Department of Education, except for the Group Projects.

The FLAS Fellowship program plus the Fulbright-Hays programs administered by ED (except for the Group Projects) provide relatively large amounts of aid to relatively few individuals. The FLAS Fellowships average more than $8,000 per person, while some of ED's Fulbright-Hays programs provide more than $20,000 per person. While the purposes of these programs are worthwhile, their provision of such levels of aid to so few people may be inefficient when the total level of funds for foreign language and international studies is constrained and newly authorized programs with potentially broader impact are not funded. However, an argument against reducing support of these programs might be based on the long term decline in the number of degrees awarded in foreign language and related fields. This decline might worsen if the FLAS fellowship program, in particular, were terminated.

Aid to Centers for International Business Education is obviously similar to the general Business and International Education program. The key differences are that the Centers are to provide a concentration of services and resources, including research, and are to receive relatively long term Federal assistance. However, the authorized services are otherwise quite similar under the 2 programs, and grants are typically made for a 3 year period under the regular Business and International Education program. Also, in practice, grants have been larger for the Centers program, but still may not represent a concentration of resources that is qualitatively greater than under the regular program.[60]

---

[60]For FY 1989, the average grant under the regular Business and International Education program was approximately $66,000, while the average Center grant was approximately $148,000.

CONSOLIDATE AND SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND FEDERAL AID TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION THROUGH ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOUNDATION OR ENDOWMENT

Proponents of greater, more visible, and better coordinated Federal aid to foreign language and international studies education have occasionally proposed the creation of an independent Federal agency--a Foundation or Endowment, for example--to administer these programs.[61] Such proposals have usually included consolidation, or at least central administration, of existing programs, as well as initiation of new forms of Federal aid to such education. Some of the proposals would also move international educational exchange programs, currently administered by the USIA and other agencies, to the new endowment or foundation.

Proponents of greater, more visible, and better coordinated Federal aid to foreign language and international studies education have occasionally proposed the creation of an independent Federal agency--a Foundation or Endowment, for example--to administer these programs.

The current National Endowments for the Arts and for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation are taken as models for these proposals. The proposed entity would be an independent--i.e., not part of a Cabinet Department--executive branch agency. A key difference between an endowment and a foundation is that an endowment would be authorized and encouraged to solicit and accept contributions from the private sector, such as philanthropic foundations, for its programs.

The primary purposes of the new agency would be to coordinate administration of current Federal programs for foreign language and international studies, to increase legislative and public attention to international education concerns and issues, and to increase funding for these programs. Opponents of these proposals have argued that separating international education from other education programs would lead to new coordination problems, that a separate agency would have insufficient "clout" in budget negotiations, and that increased visibility for international studies might make them a target for budget reductions as well as increases.

---

[61]See, for example, *International Educators Eye Endowment Plan*. Education Week, Sept. 21, 1989. p. 6, and *Time May Be Right For Creation Of Foundation For International Studies*. Education Daily, Nov. 10, 1986. p. 4. In addition, the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS), which includes several educational and business organizations as members, is currently developing a proposal for a National Endowment for International Education and Competence.

Either in conjunction with, or separate from, an endowment or foundation, the Congress may want to consider authorizing new forms of Federal aid to foreign language and international studies. Those listed below are aspects of such education that are not now explicitly authorized, or if authorized are not funded, and that various study commissions have recommended as worthy of support, or where a need for support may be implied by existing research or statistical trends. These areas include:

- preservice and inservice training of elementary and secondary foreign language teachers,[62]
- more extensive research on foreign language instruction, including research on the most effective methods of instruction, ways of evaluating how much students have learned, and uses for new forms of instructional technology,[63]
- a broader range of services to businesses attempting to increase their foreign exports,[64]
- preparation and dissemination of foreign language instructional materials, including videotapes, computer software, videodiscs, etc., and
- telecommunications linkages to disseminate instruction in foreign languages, including linkages between American classrooms and those in foreign countries, whereby pupils in each nation can practice their language knowledge with each other.[65]

---

[62]Federal aid for such teacher education has been proposed in S. 1690 and H.R. 2188, 101st Congress.

[63]As noted earlier, some such research is currently supported under HEA title VI, and conducted with non-Federal support at the National Foreign Language Center. ED also has stated its intention to fund a center for research on foreign language education in FY 1990.

[64]Support for such services to small and medium sized businesses would be authorized under S. 1690 and H.R. 2188, 101st Congress.

[65]Federal aid for demonstrations in foreign language "distance learning" in elementary and secondary schools would be authorized by S. 1690 and H.R. 2188, 101st Congress.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

If current course enrollment and related trends continue, interest in foreign language and international studies education is likely to be broader than at any time since at least the 1960s. This is especially true at the high school level, where foreign language enrollments are rising rapidly. In contrast, however, the number of postsecondary degrees granted in these subjects remains relatively low.

This interest seems likely to draw renewed attention to the Federal role in this area of education, a role that has been relatively modest yet is consistent with such basic national concerns as defense, diplomacy, and international trade competitiveness. This process has already resulted in authorization of new Federal foreign language and international studies aid programs, and may lead to further revision or expansion of Federal support.